

**U.S. Bankruptcy Court
California Northern Bankruptcy Court (San Francisco)
Bankruptcy Petition #: 19-30088**

Assigned to: Judge Dennis Montali
Chapter 11
Voluntary
Asset

Date filed: 01/29/2019
Plan confirmed: 06/20/2020
341 meeting: 04/29/2019
Deadline for filing claims: 10/21/2019
Deadline for filing claims (govt.): 10/21/2019

Debtor

PG&E Corporation
77 Beale Street
P.O. Box 770000
San Francisco, CA 94177
SAN FRANCISCO-CA
(929) 333-8977
Tax ID / EIN: 94-3234914

represented by **Max Africk**
Weil, Gotshal & Manges LLP
767 Fifth Avenue
New York, NY 10153
212-310-8000
TERMINATED: 11/12/2019

Peter J. Benvenutti
Keller Benvenutti Kim LLP
650 California St. 19th Fl.
San Francisco, CA 94108
(415) 364-6798
Email: pbenvenutti@kbklp.com

Kevin Bostel
Weil, Gotshal & Manges LLP
767 Fifth Avenue
New York, NY 10153
212-310-8000

Lee Brand
Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw Pittman LLP
Four Embarcadero Center, 22nd Fl.
San Francisco, CA 94111-5998
415-983-1116
Email: lee.brand@pillsburylaw.com

Timothy G. Cameron
Cravath, Swaine & Moore LLP
Worldwide Plaza
825 8th Ave.
New York, NY 10019
(212) 474-1120

Jared R. Friedmann
Weil, Gotshal & Manges LLP
767 Fifth Ave.
New York, NY 10153
(212) 310-8000

Andriana Georgallas
Weil, Gotshal & Manges LLP
767 Fifth Avenue
New York, NY 10153
212-310-8000

Stuart J. Goldring
Weil, Gotshal & Manges LLP
767 Fifth Ave.
New York, NY 10153
(212) 310-8000

Matthew Goren
Weil, Gotshal & Manges LLP
767 Fifth Avenue
New York, NY 10153
212-310-8000

David A. Herman
Cravath, Swaine & Moore LLP
825 Eighth Avenue
New York, NY 10019
212-474-1000

Stephen Karotkin
Weil, Gotshal & Manges LLP
767 Fifth Avenue
New York, NY 10153
212-310-8000

Tobias S. Keller
Keller Benvenuti Kim LLP
650 California St. #1900
San Francisco, CA 94108
(415) 796-0709
Email: tkeller@kbkllp.com

Jane Kim
Keller Benvenuti Kim LLP
650 California St, Suite 1900
San Francisco, CA 94108
(415) 364-6793
Email: jkim@kbkllp.com

Katherine Kohn
Groom Law Group, Chartered
1701 Pennsylvania Ave, NW #1200
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 861-2607
Email: kkohn@groom.com

Kevin Kramer
Weil, Gotshal & Manges LLP
767 Fifth Avenue
New York, NY 10153
212-310-8000

David Levine
Groom Law Group, Chartered
1701 Pennsylvania Ave, NW #1200
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 861-5436
Email: dnl@groom.com

Dara Levinson Silveira
Keller Benvenuti Kim LLP
650 California St. #1900
San Francisco, CA 94108

415-364-6793
Email: dsilveira@kbkllp.com

Jessica Liou
Weil, Gotshal & Manges LLP
767 Fifth Avenue
New York, NY 10153
212-310-8000

Omid H. Nasab
Cravath, Swaine & Moore LLP
825 Eighth Avenue
New York, NY 10019
212-474-1000

John Nolan
Weil, Gotshal & Manges LLP
767 Fifth Avenue
New York, NY 10153
212-310-8000

Kevin J. Orsini
Cravath, Swaine & Moore LLP
825 Eighth Avenue
New York, NY 10019
212-474-1000

Thomas B. Rupp
Keller Benvenuti Kim LLP
650 California Street, Suite 1900
San Francisco, CA 94108
415-636-9015
Email: trupp@kbkllp.com

Bradley R. Schneider
Munger Tolles and Olson LLP
350 S Grand Ave., 50th Fl.
Los Angeles, CA 90071
(213) 683-9100
Email: bradley.schneider@mto.com

Ray C. Schrock
Weil, Gotshal & Manges LLP
767 Fifth Avenue
New York, NY 10153
212-310-8000

Richard W. Slack
Weil Gotshal and Manges, LLP
767 Fifth Ave.
New York, NY 10153-0119
(212) 310-8000
Email: richard.slack@weil.com

Theodore Tsekerides
Weil, Gotshal & Manges LLP
767 Fifth Avenue
New York, NY 10153
212-310-8000

Paul H. Zumbro
Cravath, Swaine & Moore LLP
85 Eighth Avenue

New York, NY 10019
2124741000
Email: mao@cravath.com

Responsible Ind

Jason P. Wells

Senior Vice President
Chief Financial Officer PG&E Corporation
77 Beale St.
San Francisco, CA 94177
(929) 333-8977

U.S. Trustee

Office of the U.S. Trustee / SF

Phillip J. Burton Federal Building
450 Golden Gate Ave. 5th Fl., #05-0153
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415)705-3333

represented by **Jason Blumberg**

Office of the U.S. Trustee
501 I St. #7-500
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 930-2076
Email: jason.blumberg@usdoj.gov

Cameron Gulden

Office of the United States Trustee
300 Booth St., Room 3009
Reno, NV 89509
(775) 784-5335
Email: cameron.m.gulden@usdoj.gov

Lynette C. Kelly

Office of the United States Trustee
Phillip J. Burton Federal Building
450 Golden Gate Ave. 5th Fl., #05-0153
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 252-2065
Email: ustpregion17.oa.ecf@usdoj.gov

Timothy S. Laffredi

Office of the U. S. Trustee – San Jose
280 South 1 St., Suite 268
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 535-5525
Email: timothy.s.laffredi@usdoj.gov

Timothy S. Laffredi

Office of the U.S. Trustee – SF
450 Golden Gate Ave.
Suite 05-0153
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 705-3333
Email: timothy.s.laffredi@usdoj.gov

Marta Villacorta

Office of the United States Trustee
Phillip J. Burton Federal Building
450 Golden Gate Ave. 5th Fl., #05-0153
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 252-2062
Email: marta.villacorta@usdoj.gov

Creditor Committee

Official Committee Of Unsecured Creditors

represented by **Paul S. Aronzon**

Milbank LLP
2029 Century Park East, 33rd Fl.
Los Angeles, CA 90067
(424) 386-4000

Email: paronzon@milbank.com

James C. Behrens
Milbank, LLP
2029 Century Park E, 33rd Fl.
Los Angeles, CA 90067
(424) 386-4436
Email: jbehrens@milbank.com

Gregory A. Bray
Milbank LLP
2029 Century Park East, 33rd Fl.
Los Angeles, CA 90067
(424) 386-4470
Email: gbray@milbank.com

Erin Elizabeth Dexter
Milbank LLP
1850 K St., NW, #1100
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 835-7500
Email: edexter@milbank.com

Dennis F. Dunne
Milbank, LLP
55 Hudson Yards
New York, NY 10001-2163
(212) 530-5000
Email: ddunne@milbank.com

Samuel A. Khalil
Milbank, LLP
55 Hudson Yards
New York, NY 10001-2163
(212) 530-5000
Email: skhalil@milbank.com

Thomas R. Kreller
Milbank LLP
2029 Century Park East, 33rd
Los Angeles, CA 90067
(424) 386-4463
Email: tkreller@milbank.com

Andrew Michael Leblanc
Milbank LLP
1850 K St., NW, #1100
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 835-7500
Email: ALeblanc@milbank.com

Alan J. Stone
Milbank LLP
55 Hudson Yards
New York, NY 10001
(212) 530-5000
Email: AStone@milbank.com

Creditor Committee
Official Committee of Tort Claimants

represented by **Lauren T. Attard**
Baker Hostetler LLP
11601 Wilshire Blvd. #1400
Los Angeles, CA 90025-0509

(310) 820-8800
Email: lattard@bakerlaw.com

Chris Bator

Baker & Hostetler LLP
127 Public Square #2000
Cleveland, OH 44114
(216) 621-0200
Email: cbator@bakerlaw.com

Dustin M. Dow

Baker & Hostetler LLP
127 Public Square #2000
Cleveland, OH 44114
(216) 621-0200
Email: ddow@bakerlaw.com

Cecily Ann Dumas

Baker and Hostetler LLP
Transamerica Pyramid Center
600 Montgomery Street, Suite 3100
San Francisco, CA 94111-2806
415-659-2600
Email: cdumas@bakerlaw.com

Joseph M. Esmont

Baker & Hostetler LLP
127 Public Sq., #2000
Cleveland, OH 44147
(216) 861-7835
Email: jesmont@bakerlaw.com

Lars H. Fuller

Baker & Hostetler LLP
1801 California St #4400
Denver, CO 80202
(303) 764-4114
Email: lfuller@bakerlaw.com

Eric R. Goodman

Baker & Hostetler LLP
Key Tower, 127 Public Sq., #2000
Cleveland, OH 44114-1214
(216) 621-0200
Email: egoodman@bakerlaw.com

Elizabeth A. Green

BakerHostetler LLP
200 S. Orange Ave. #2300
Orlando, FL 32801
(407) 649-4000
Email: egreen@bakerlaw.com

Robert A. Julian

Baker and Hostetler LLP
Transamerica Pyramid Center
600 Montgomery Street, Suite 3100
San Francisco, CA 94111-2806
(415) 569-2600
Email: rjulian@bakerlaw.com

Elyssa S. Kates

Baker & Hostetler LLP

45 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, NY 10111
(212) 589-4227
Email: ekates@bakerlaw.com

Kody D. L. Kleber
Baker & Hostetler LLP
811 Main St., #1100
Houston, TX 77005
(713) 703-1315
Email: kkleber@bakerlaw.com

John H. MacConaghy
MacConaghy and Barnier
645 1st St. W #D
Sonoma, CA 95476
(707) 935-3205
Email: macclaw@macbarlaw.com

Kimberly S. Morris
Baker & Hostetler LLP
Transamerica Pyramid Center
600 Montgomery Street, Suite 3100
San Francisco, CA 94111
(415) 659-2600
Email: kmorris@bakerlaw.com

David J. Richardson
Baker & Hostetler, LLP
11601 Wilshire Blvd.,
14th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025
(310) 442-8858
Email: drichardson@bakerlaw.com

David B. Rivkin, Jr.
Baker and Hostetler LLP
1050 Connecticut Ave., N.W., #1100
Washington, DC 20036
(202) 861-1731
Email: drivkin@bakerlaw.com

Jorian L. Rose
Baker & Hostetler LLP
45 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, NY 10111
(212) 589-4200
Email: jrose@bakerlaw.com

Eric E. Sagerman
Baker and Hostetler LLP
11601 Wilshire Blvd. #1400
Los Angeles, CA 90025
(310) 442-8875
Email: esagerman@bakerlaw.com

Catherine E. Woltering
Baker & Hostetler LLP
Key Tower, 127 Public Sq., #2000
Cleveland, OH 44114-1214
(614) 462-2677
Email: cwoltering@bakerlaw.com
TERMINATED: 04/01/2020

Filing Date	#	Docket Text
10/22/2020	<u>9333</u>	Memorandum Decision Disallowing Administrative Expense Claims (RE: related document(s) <u>8536</u> Motion to Reconsider filed by Interested Party Elliott Management Corporation, <u>8663</u> Joinder filed by Interested Party Canyon Capital Advisors LLC, Interested Party Citadel Advisors LLC, Interested Party Davidson Kempner Capital Management LP, Interested Party Farallon Capital Management, L.L.C., Interested Party Sculptor Master Fund, Ltd., Interested Party Varde Partners, Inc., Interested Party Sculptor Enhanced Master Fund, Ltd., Interested Party Sculptor Credit Opportunities Master Fund, Ltd., Interested Party Sculptor GC Opportunities Master Fund, Ltd., Interested Party Sculptor SC II, LP, <u>8704</u> Joinder filed by Interested Party Pacific Investment Management Company LLC). (lp) (Entered: 10/22/2020)
10/22/2020	<u>9335</u>	Order Disallowing Administrative Expense Claims of Canyon Capital Advisors LLC et al. (RE: related document(s) <u>8663</u> Joinder filed by Interested Party Canyon Capital Advisors LLC, Interested Party Citadel Advisors LLC, Interested Party Davidson Kempner Capital Management LP, Interested Party Farallon Capital Management, L.L.C., Interested Party Sculptor Master Fund, Ltd., Interested Party Varde Partners, Inc., Interested Party Sculptor Enhanced Master Fund, Ltd., Interested Party Sculptor Credit Opportunities Master Fund, Ltd., Interested Party Sculptor GC Opportunities Master Fund, Ltd., Interested Party Sculptor SC II, LP, <u>9034</u> Response filed by Interested Party Canyon Capital Advisors LLC, Interested Party Citadel Advisors LLC, Interested Party Davidson Kempner Capital Management LP, Interested Party Farallon Capital Management, L.L.C., Interested Party Sculptor Master Fund, Ltd., Interested Party Varde Partners, Inc., Interested Party Sculptor Enhanced Master Fund, Ltd., Interested Party Sculptor Credit Opportunities Master Fund, Ltd., Interested Party Sculptor GC Opportunities Master Fund, Ltd., Interested Party Sculptor SC II, LP, Interested Party Pacific Investment Management Company LLC). (lp) (Entered: 10/22/2020)
11/04/2020	<u>9403</u>	Notice of Appeal to District Court , Fee Amount \$ 298. (RE: related document(s) <u>9333</u> Memorandum Decision, <u>9335</u> Order). Appellant Designation due by 11/20/2020. Statement of Issues due by 11/20/2020. Transmission of Record to District Court due by 12/4/2020. (Attachments: # <u>1</u> Exhibit A – Order Disallowing Administrative Expense Claims # <u>2</u> Exhibit B – Memorandum Decision) Filed by Interested Partys Canyon Capital Advisors LLC, Citadel Advisors LLC, Davidson Kempner Capital Management LP, Farallon Capital Management, L.L.C., Sculptor Credit Opportunities Master Fund, Ltd., Sculptor Enhanced Master Fund, Ltd., Sculptor GC Opportunities Master Fund, Ltd., Sculptor Master Fund, Ltd., Sculptor SC II, LP, Varde Partners, Inc. (Anker, Philip) (Entered: 11/04/2020)



Signed and Filed: October 22, 2020

Dennis Montali

DENNIS MONTALI
U.S. Bankruptcy Judge

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

In re:) Bankruptcy Case
PG&E CORPORATION,) No. 19-30088-DM
)
- and -) Chapter 11
)
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY,) Jointly Administered
)
Reorganized Debtors.) Date: October 13, 2020
) Time: 10:30 a.m.
) Hearing held via Zoom
☐ Affects PG&E Corporation)
☐ Affects Pacific Gas and)
Electric Company)
☒ Affects both Debtors)
* All papers shall be filed in)
the Lead Case, No. 19-30088 (DM).)

MEMORANDUM DECISION DISALLOWING ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSE CLAIMS

I. INTRODUCTION.

A group of claimants ("the RSA Noteholders") have asserted administrative expense claims arising from the Reorganized Debtors' purported breach of a post-petition restructuring agreement, estimated to be in the aggregate of \$250,000,000, against the Reorganized Debtors. For the reasons explained

1 below, the court will sustain the objections of the Reorganized
2 Debtors and disallow the claims.

3 **II. PARTIES.**

4 Elliott Management Corporation ("Elliott") on its own
5 behalf and on behalf of certain funds and accounts managed,
6 advised, or sub-advised by it, filed the *Motion for (i)*
7 *Allowance and Payment of an Administrative Expense Claim and*
8 *(ii) to the Extent Necessary, Reconsideration and Relief from*
9 *the Confirmation Order Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil*
10 *Procedure 60(b)* on July 24, 2020 (Dkt. 8536). This motion and
11 request for allowance and payment of an administrative expense
12 is based on a purported breach by Debtors of a post-petition
13 restructuring agreement that they entered with certain
14 noteholders (the "Noteholder RSA"). Elliott was joined by
15 several similarly situated claimants who filed their *Joinder in*
16 *the Pending Elliott Motion and Request for Allowance and Payment*
17 *of Administrative Expense Claim* on August 4, 2020 (Dkt. 8663).¹
18 Pacific Investment Management Company LLC ("PIMCO") joined them
19 and Elliott when it filed its *Joinder of Pacific Investment*
20 *Management Company LLC in the Pending Elliott Motion and Request*
21 *for Allowance and Payment of Administrative Expense Claim* on
22 August 7, 2020 (Dkt. 8704).

23
24
25 ¹ Joining Elliott at that time were: Canyon Capital Advisors LLC, Citadel
26 Advisors LLC, Davidson Kempner Capital Management LP, Farallon Capital
27 Management, L.L.C., Sculptor Master Fund, Ltd., Sculptor Enhanced Master
28 Fund, Ltd., Sculptor Credit Opportunities Master Fund, Ltd., Sculptor GC
Opportunities Master Fund, Ltd., Sculptor SC II, LP, and Värde Partners,
Inc., on behalf of themselves, and/or certain funds and accounts managed,
advised, or sub-advised by them.

1 PG&E Corporation and Pacific Gas and Electric Company
2 ("Reorganized Debtors") filed *Reorganized Debtors' Initial*
3 *Opposition to Elliott Management Corporation's Motion for*
4 *Allowance and Payment of Administrative Expense Claim and*
5 *Reconsideration of Confirmation Order and Related Joinders* as an
6 initial opposition to Elliott's Motion on August 26, 2020 (Dkt.
7 8864). Elliott and the others filed their respective responses:
8 *Elliott Management Corporation's Response to Reorganized*
9 *Debtors' Initial Opposition to Motion for (i) Allowance and*
10 *Payment of an Administrative Expense Claim and (ii) to the*
11 *Extent Necessary, Reconsideration and Relief from the*
12 *Confirmation Order Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure*
13 *60(b)* (Dkt. 9032) and *Additional RSA Noteholders' Response to*
14 *Reorganized Debtors' Initial Opposition to Elliott Motion for*
15 *Allowance and Payment of Administrative Expense Claim and*
16 *Reconsideration of Confirmation Order and Related Joinders* (Dkt.
17 9034) on September 14. Reorganized Debtors filed their *Reply in*
18 *Support of Initial Opposition to Elliott Management*
19 *Corporation's Motion for Allowance and Payment of Administrative*
20 *Expense Claim and Reconsideration of Confirmation Order and*
21 *Related Joinders* on September 25, 2020 (Dkt. 9143).

22 The motion came on for hearing on October 13, 2020.
23 Appearances were noted on the record.

24 **III. CRITICAL DATES, PLAN PROVISIONS AND PARAGRAPHS OF THE**
25 **OCP.**

26 On February 5, 2020, the court approved the Noteholder RSA
27 following extensive negotiations among the Reorganized Debtors
28

(prior to confirmation of their Plan), certain Shareholders Proponents, and certain holders of funded debt claims.

The court entered its *Order Confirming Debtors' and Shareholder Proponents' Joint Chapter 11 Plan of Reorganization Dated June 19, 2020* (the "OCP") on June 20, 2020, confirming the Debtors' and Shareholders Proponents' Joint Chapter 11 Plan of Reorganization Dated June 19, 2020 (the "Plan") (Dkt. 8053). The Plan became effective as of July 1, 2020 (the "Effective Date").

The critical and determinative provisions relevant to this decision are as follows:

Plan, Article 2.1 **Administrative Expense Claims**

Plan, Article 10.8 **Exculpation**

Plan, Article 10.9(b) ***Releases by Holders of Claims and Interest***

OCP, ¶ 54 **Exculpation**

OCP, ¶ 56 **Releases by Holders of Claims and Interest.**

The Noteholder RSA contains a provision ("the best efforts provision") that the RSA Noteholders contend the Reorganized Debtors breached, thus establishing a basis for their administrative expense claims. That is found in Section 3(a)(iv) of the Noteholder RSA and obligates the debtors (prior to confirmation and up to the Effective Date), and their attorneys, advisors, and agents to:

use their best efforts, which shall not require the Debtors to pay any consideration, breach any obligations, or otherwise violate the terms of any Backstop Commitment Letter, to cause various Backstop Parties to transfer (whether by assignment, participation, or otherwise) to

1 Consenting Noteholders that were parties to the
2 AHC Commitment Letter and any Consenting
3 Noteholders that were offered the opportunity to
4 participate in any subsequent commitment in
5 connection with the Alternative Plan, their
6 rights (subject to Section 7 hereof) (including
7 the right to receive fees thereunder) and
8 obligations under applicable Backstop Commitment
9 Letters relating to up to \$2 billion of
10 commitments.

11 **IV. PROCEDURAL STATUS.**

12 On August 11, 2020, the court entered an *Order Regarding*
13 *Scheduling with Respect to Elliott Management Corporation Motion*
14 *for Allowance and Payment of Administrative Expense Claim and*
15 *Related Joinders* (Dkt. 8746). There the court established a
16 procedure to determine whether the Reorganized Debtors could
17 prevail on the face of Elliott's motion, as joined by the
18 others, as a matter of law, avoiding the need for discovery or
19 other unnecessary delay. The Reorganized Debtors' challenge to
20 the administrative expense claims of the RSA Noteholders is a
21 contested matter under Fed. R. Bankr. P. 9014; that rule in turn
22 incorporates relevant provisions of the Federal Rules of Civil
23 Procedure via the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure.

24 Accordingly, the court treats the matters that were briefed
25 and argued on October 13, 2020 as the functional equivalent of a
26 motion for a judgment on the pleadings, taking all facts as
27 uncontested for these purposes. It determines as a matter of
28 law that the Reorganized Debtors are correct and their
objections should be sustained.

//

//

1 **V. DISCUSSION.**

2 **A. Administrative Expense Claims - Allowed or Disallowed**

3 The RSA Noteholders make much of a statement in Section 2.1
4 of the Plan that no administrative expense claims shall be
5 discharged and contend that their claim for breach of the
6 Noteholder RSA constitutes an administrative expense claim and
7 that Debtors' proposed treatment of the claim conflicts with
8 Articles 10.8 and 10.9 of the Plan and paragraphs 54 and 56 of
9 the OCP.

10 The court disagrees. Article 1.4 preserves expenses of
11 administration that are **allowable**; the corollary is that
12 administrative expense claims that are not allowable will be
13 discharged and, of course, will not be paid. As stated at the
14 outset, the court is disallowing the administrative expense
15 claims of the RSA Noteholders. The concern about discharge is
16 moot and no further action by the court is necessary as to this
17 issue.

18 **B. Negotiation and Pursuit of the Noteholder RSA**

19 In the *Memorandum of Decision - Confirmation of Debtors'*
20 *and Shareholder Proponents' Joint Chapter 11 Plan of*
21 *Reorganization* (Dkt. 8001), the court referred to the recent
22 Ninth Circuit *Blixseth* decision² in support of the proposition
23 that exculpation provisions permit protection of various parties
24 "who participated in the approval process", pointing out that
25 the exculpation provisions of the Plan cover a multitude of
26

27 ² *Blixseth v. Credit Suisse (In re Blixseth)*, 961 F.3d 1074 (9th Cir.
28 2020).

1 players, a number of documents and a number of events and
2 activities, consistent with the complexity and difficulties of
3 these cases. *Blixseth* itself cited *In re PWS Holding Corp.*, 228
4 F.3d 224 (3d Cir. 2000), for the notion that partial exculpation
5 is the norm for acts committed during the process of developing
6 and confirming a chapter 11 plan. Such provisions do not
7 conflict with 11 U.S.C. § 524(e).

8 For this reason, it is appropriate and consistent with
9 *Blixseth*, to extend exculpation to parties who participated,
10 negotiated and even "pursued" the Noteholder RSA and countless
11 other documents. But once the negotiation was completed, the
12 pursuit was over. Article 10.8 provides the safe harbor for all
13 who accomplished that end, for all who were "involved in the
14 process of developing and confirming [the Plan]". When the
15 Noteholder RSA was approved by the court on February 5, 2020
16 (Dkt. 5637) there was nothing further to negotiate or pursue
17 concerning that document. To use the vernacular, it was a "done
18 deal".

19 The RSA Noteholders are correct that they had the right to
20 contend at a later date that Reorganized Debtors, prior to or
21 concurrent with confirmation of the Plan, breached the best
22 efforts provision, subject to whatever defenses the Reorganized
23 Debtors may assert. Thus, the court concludes that the
24 exculpation provisions of Article 10.8, and the parallel
25 provisions of paragraph 54 of the OCP provide no relief for the
26 Reorganized Debtors.

27 //

1 **C. Releases by Holders of Claims and Interest**

2 In contrast to the narrow exculpation provisions dealing
3 with "negotiation and pursuit" of various documents and
4 including a fairly typical carveout for actual fraud or willful
5 misconduct, the release provisions and the parallel paragraph 56
6 of the OCP are quite a different story. There, there is no
7 carveout for actual fraud or willful misconduct nor any
8 limitation on the extent and breadth of what has been released.
9 The provisions are lengthy, somewhat redundant and very
10 lawyerlike. Below the court highlights certain provisions to
11 emphasize how far reaching they are and how readily they
12 encompass any alleged breach of the best efforts provision:

13 **"Released Parties** [including the Reorganized
14 Debtors] are deemed forever **released** and
15 discharged . . . from any and all claims, interests,
16 obligations, suits, judgments, damages, demands,
17 debts, rights, Causes of Action, losses, remedies,
18 and **liabilities whatsoever** . . . based on or
19 relating to, or in any manner arising from, in **whole**
20 **or in part**, the Debtors', the Fires', the Chapter 11
21 Cases . . . the subject matter of, or the
22 **transactions** or events giving rise to any
23 Claim . . . the business or contractual arrangements
24 between any Debtor and any Released Parties . . .
25 the **Plan Funding**, the Restructuring . . . before or
26 during the Chapter 11 Cases . . . the **Backstop**
27 **Commitment** Letters . . . the **Noteholder RSA** . . .
28 the negotiation, formulation, or preparation
of . . . the Plan and related agreements . . . , and
"other documents (including Plan documents) . . . ,
the **Noteholder RSA**"

25 Based upon these broad provisions the court determines that
26 the RSA Noteholders are bound by the releases they agreed to,
27 thus relieving the Reorganized Debtors of any exposure to claims
28

1 by the RSA Noteholders for breach of the Noteholder RSA and in
2 particular the best efforts provisions.

3 **D. Post Effective Date Claims**

4 The RSA Noteholders point to the preamble of Article
5 10.9(b) to maintain that somehow their right to assert the
6 administrative expense claims survives confirmation and the
7 Effective Date, and thus can be asserted, subject to substantive
8 defenses, at this juncture. The court rejects that argument.

9 Article 10.9(b) begins:

10 *"Releases by Holders of Claims and Interests. As*
11 *of and subject to the occurrence of the Effective*
12 *Date, except for the rights that remain in effect*
13 *from and after the Effective Date to enforce the*
Plan"

14 The RSA Noteholders argue that the Reorganized Debtors
15 breached the best efforts provision by not even attempting to
16 have any of the Backstop Commitment parties share with them any
17 of the fees and other entitlements up to \$2 billion of
18 commitments as provided in the portion of the Noteholder RSA
19 quoted above. The best efforts provision was a continuing
20 obligation for the duration of the RSA Support Period, defined
21 as running from the date of execution of the Noteholder RSA
22 through the Effective Date of the Plan. The provisions of
23 Section 3(a)(4) ended on that Effective Date and thus do not
24 come within the phrase "rights that **remain** in effect **from and**
25 **after** the Effective Date." The RSA Noteholders had no right to
26 complain about the Reorganized Debtors' lack of best efforts
27 once the obligations to exercise them ceased. The releases
28

1 became effective at the same time that the right to assert best
2 efforts ended. Whether the RSA Noteholders could have asserted
3 some sort of a breach prior to the Effective Date, and prior to
4 the effectiveness of the broad releases, is pure speculation.
5 It did not happen. The after-the-fact assertions of the
6 administrative expense claims were barred as a matter of law by
7 the operation of the releases in Article 10.9(b) and OCP ¶ 56 as
8 of the Effective Date.

9 **E. Other Issues**

10 Because the court is disallowing the RSA Noteholders'
11 administrative expense claims for the reasons stated above, it
12 need not address the alternative theories of waiver or
13 forfeiture asserted by the Reorganized Debtors.

14 RSA Noteholders ask for alternative relief from the OCP.
15 Reorganized Debtors are correct that modification of the Plan
16 could only be attempted in accordance with 11 U.S.C. § 1127(b).
17 And the RSA Noteholders are correct that Fed. R. Bankr. P. 9024,
18 incorporating Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b), has been a basis for relief
19 from orders confirming plans. On this record, however, nothing
20 justifies granting the extraordinary alternative relief they
21 seek.

22 The record does show that at a lightning fast pace in June,
23 2020, this complicated case proceeded quickly to meet state-
24 imposed deadlines and presented myriad obstacles for all
25 principal players and the court. Given that history, the court
26 believes that Elliott and the other concerned RSA Noteholders
27 could have dealt with procedural difficulties such as the
28

1 original confirmation objection deadline or the fact that the
2 confirmation record had been closed by the time of the June 9,
3 2020, Backstop Motion. They could have sought some form of
4 expedited relief before entry of the OCP were they so included.

5 All major players are and were represented by some of the
6 most experienced and qualified bankruptcy counsel in the
7 country, and they know how to act quickly and effectively when
8 they need to. While the court will not engage in a theoretical
9 debate about whether one side waited in the weeds or the other
10 side tried to hide the ball, it will decline to excise its
11 discretion by reconsidering the OCP under Fed. R. Bankr. P. 9024
12 or otherwise.

13 **VI. CONCLUSION.**

14 The court is concurrently issuing orders disallowing the
15 administrative expense claims of Elliott, the Additional RSA
16 Noteholders and PIMCO for the reasons stated in this memorandum
17 decision.

18 *** END OF MEMORANDUM DECISION***
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28



Signed and Filed: October 22, 2020

Dennis Montali

DENNIS MONTALI
U.S. Bankruptcy Judge

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

In re:) Bankruptcy Case
PG&E CORPORATION,) No. 19-30088-DM
) Chapter 11
- and -) Jointly Administered
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY,)
)
Reorganized Debtors.) Date: October 13, 2020
) Time: 10:30 a.m.
) Hearing held via Zoom
☐ Affects PG&E Corporation)
☐ Affects Pacific Gas and)
Electric Company)
☒ Affects both Debtors)
)
* All papers shall be filed in)
the Lead Case, No. 19-30088 (DM).)

**ORDER DISALLOWING ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSE CLAIMS OF
CANYON CAPITAL ADVISORS LLC ET AL.¹**

¹ The claimants are: Canyon Capital Advisors LLC, Citadel Advisors LLC, Davidson Kempner Capital Management LP, Farallon Capital Management, L.L.C., Sculptor Master Fund, Ltd., Sculptor Enhanced Master Fund, Ltd., Sculptor Credit Opportunities Master Fund, Ltd., Sculptor GC Opportunities Master Fund, Ltd., Sculptor SC II, LP, and Värde Partners, Inc., on behalf of themselves, and/or certain funds and accounts managed, advised, or sub-advised by them.

1 For the reasons stated in the Memorandum Decision
2 Disallowing Administrative Expense Claims issued this date, the
3 administrative expense claims asserted by Canyon Capital
4 Advisors LLC et al. (Dkts. 8663 and 9034), and opposed by the
5 Reorganized Debtors, are DISALLOWED.

6 *** END OF ORDER***
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Philip D. Anker (*Pro Hac Vice* admitted)
Allyson Pierce (Cal. Bar No. 325060)
**WILMER CUTLER PICKERING HALE
AND DORR LLP**
250 Greenwich Street
New York, NY 10007
Telephone: 212.230.8800
Facsimile: 212.230.8888
philip.anker@wilmerhale.com
allyson.pierce@wilmerhale.com

Christopher T. Casamassima (Cal. Bar No.
211280)
**WILMER CUTLER PICKERING HALE
AND DORR LLP**
350 South Grand Avenue, Suite 2100
Los Angeles, CA 90071
Telephone: 213.443.5300
Facsimile: 213.443.5400
chris.casamassima@wilmerhale.com

*Counsel to Canyon, Citadel, Davidson Kempner, Farallon, Sculptor, and Värde, on behalf of
themselves, and certain funds and counts managed, advised, or sub-advised by them*

**UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

In re:

PG&E CORPORATION,

- and -

**PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC
COMPANY,**

Reorganized Debtors.

- ☐ Affects PG&E Corporation
☐ Affects Pacific Gas and Electric Company
☒ Affects both Debtors

**All papers shall be filed in the Lead Case,
No. 19-30088 (DM)*

Case No. 19-30088 (DM)
Chapter 11
(Lead Case)
(Jointly Administered)

**NOTICE OF APPEAL AND
STATEMENT OF ELECTION TO HAVE
APPEAL HEARD BY DISTRICT COURT**

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that Canyon Capital Advisors LLC (“Canyon”), Citadel
Advisors LLC (“Citadel”), Davidson Kempner Capital Management LP (“Davidson Kempner”),
Farallon Capital Management, L.L.C. (“Farallon”), Sculptor Master Fund, Ltd., Sculptor
Enhanced Master Fund, Ltd., Sculptor Credit Opportunities Master Fund, Ltd., Sculptor GC

Opportunities Master Fund, Ltd., Sculptor SC II, LP (collectively, “Sculptor”), and Värde Partners, Inc. (“Värde”), on behalf of themselves, and/or certain funds and accounts managed, advised, or sub-advised by them (collectively, the “RSA Noteholders” or “Appellants”), by and through their undersigned counsel, hereby appeal to the United States District Court for the Northern District of California, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 158(a) and Rule 8003 of the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure, from the *Order Disallowing Administrative Expense Claims of Canyon Capital Advisors LLC et al.* [Bankr. Dkt. No. 9335] (the “Order”) and the related *Memorandum Decision Disallowing Administrative Expense Claims* [Bankr. Dkt. No. 9333] (the “Memorandum”) entered in the above-captioned case on October 22, 2020. A copy of the Order is attached hereto as **Exhibit A**. A copy of the Memorandum is attached hereto as **Exhibit B**. The RSA Noteholders anticipate that notices of appeal of related orders [Bankr. Dkt. Nos. 9334, 9336] and the Memorandum will be filed by Elliott Management Company (“Elliott”), and by Pacific Investment Management Company LLC, as investment adviser or manager for certain funds and accounts (“PIMCO”).

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 158(a), the Order and Opinion are appealable as a matter of right. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 158(c)(1), the Appellants hereby elect to have this appeal heard by the United States District Court for the Northern District of California.

The parties to the Order (or related orders) and Memorandum, other than the RSA Noteholders, and the names, addresses and telephone numbers of their respective attorneys are set forth below.

Party	Counsel
Reorganized Debtors	WEIL, GOTSHAL & MANGES LLP Stephen Karotkin (<i>Pro Hac Vice</i> admitted) Ray C. Schrock, P.C. (<i>Pro Hac Vice</i> admitted) Jessica Liou (<i>Pro Hac Vice</i> admitted) Theodore E. Tsekerides (<i>Pro Hac Vice</i> admitted) 767 Fifth Avenue

	<p>New York, New York 10153-0119 Telephone: 212.310.8000 Facsimile: 212.310.8007 stephen.karotkin@weil.com, ray.schrock@weil.com, jessica.liou@weil.com, theodore.tsekerides@weil.com</p> <p>KELLER BENVENUTTI KIM LLP Tobias S. Keller (Cal. Bar No.151445) Peter J. Benvenutti (Cal. Bar No. 60566) Jane Kim (Cal. Bar No. 298192) 650 California Street, Suite 1900 San Francisco, California 94108 Telephone: 415.496.6723 Facsimile: 650.636.9251 tkeller@kbbkllp.com pbenvenutti@kbbkllp.com jkim@kbbkllp.com</p>
Elliott	<p>ROPES & GRAY LLP Rocky C. Tsai (Cal. Bar No. 221452) 3 Embarcadero Center San Francisco, CA 94111 Telephone: 415.315.6369 Facsimile: 415.315.6350 rocky.tsai@ropesgray.com</p> <p>ROPES & GRAY LLP Andrew G. Devore (<i>Pro Hac Vice</i> admitted) Prudential Tower 800 Boylston Street Boston, MA 02199 Telephone: 617.951.7000 Facsimile: 617.951.7050 andrew.devore@ropesgray.com</p> <p>ROPES & GRAY LLP Gregg M. Galardi (<i>Pro Hac Vice</i> admitted) Keith H. Wofford (<i>Pro Hac Vice</i> admitted) Daniel G. Egan (<i>Pro Hac Vice</i> admitted) 1211 Avenue of the Americas New York, NY 10036 Telephone: 212.596.9000 Facsimile: 212.596.9090 gregg.galardi@ropesgray.com</p>

	keith.wofford@ropesgray.com daniel.egan@ropesgray.com
PIMCO	David P. Simonds (Cal. Bar No. 214499) Edward J. McNeilly (Cal. Bar No. 314588) HOGAN LOVELLS US LLP 1999 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1400 Los Angeles, California 90067 Telephone: 310.785.4600 Facsimile: 310.785.4601 david.simonds@hoganlovells.com edward.mcneilly@hoganlovells.com Michael C. Hefter (<i>Pro Hac Vice</i> admitted) Matthew Ducharme (<i>Pro Hac Vice</i> admitted) HOGAN LOVELLS US LLP 390 Madison Avenue New York, New York 10017 Telephone: 212.918.3000 Facsimile: 212.918.3100 michael.hefter@hoganlovells.com matthew.ducharme@hoganlovells.com

[Continued on following page]

1 Dated: November 4, 2020

/s/ Philip D. Anker

Philip D. Anker (*Pro Hac Vice* admitted)
Allyson Pierce (Cal. Bar No. 325060)
**WILMER CUTLER PICKERING HALE
AND DORR LLP**
250 Greenwich Street
New York, NY 10007
Telephone: 212.230.8800
Facsimile: 212.230.8888
philip.anker@wilmerhale.com
allyson.pierce@wilmerhale.com

Christopher T. Casamassima (Cal. Bar No.
211280)
**WILMER CUTLER PICKERING HALE
AND DORR LLP**
350 South Grand Avenue, Suite 2100
Los Angeles, CA 90071
Telephone: 213.443.5300
Facsimile: 213.443.5400
chris.casamassima@wilmerhale.com

*Counsel to Canyon, Citadel, Davidson
Kempner, Farallon, Sculptor, and Värde, on
behalf of themselves, and certain funds and
counts managed, advised, or sub-advised by
them*

EXHIBIT A



Signed and Filed: October 22, 2020

Dennis Montali

DENNIS MONTALI
U.S. Bankruptcy Judge

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

In re:) Bankruptcy Case
PG&E CORPORATION,) No. 19-30088-DM
) Chapter 11
- and -) Jointly Administered
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY,)
Reorganized Debtors.) Date: October 13, 2020
) Time: 10:30 a.m.
☐ Affects PG&E Corporation) Hearing held via Zoom
☐ Affects Pacific Gas and)
Electric Company)
☒ Affects both Debtors)
* All papers shall be filed in)
the Lead Case, No. 19-30088 (DM).)

**ORDER DISALLOWING ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSE CLAIMS OF
CANYON CAPITAL ADVISORS LLC ET AL.¹**

¹ The claimants are: Canyon Capital Advisors LLC, Citadel Advisors LLC, Davidson Kempner Capital Management LP, Farallon Capital Management, L.L.C., Sculptor Master Fund, Ltd., Sculptor Enhanced Master Fund, Ltd., Sculptor Credit Opportunities Master Fund, Ltd., Sculptor GC Opportunities Master Fund, Ltd., Sculptor SC II, LP, and Värde Partners, Inc., on behalf of themselves, and/or certain funds and accounts managed, advised, or sub-advised by them.

1 For the reasons stated in the Memorandum Decision
2 Disallowing Administrative Expense Claims issued this date, the
3 administrative expense claims asserted by Canyon Capital
4 Advisors LLC et al. (Dkts. 8663 and 9034), and opposed by the
5 Reorganized Debtors, are DISALLOWED.

6 *** END OF ORDER***
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

EXHIBIT B



Signed and Filed: October 22, 2020

Dennis Montali

DENNIS MONTALI
U.S. Bankruptcy Judge

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

In re:) Bankruptcy Case
PG&E CORPORATION,) No. 19-30088-DM
) Chapter 11
- and -) Jointly Administered
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY,)
)
Reorganized Debtors.) Date: October 13, 2020
) Time: 10:30 a.m.
☐ Affects PG&E Corporation) Hearing held via Zoom
☐ Affects Pacific Gas and)
Electric Company)
☒ Affects both Debtors)
* All papers shall be filed in)
the Lead Case, No. 19-30088 (DM).)

MEMORANDUM DECISION DISALLOWING ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSE CLAIMS

I. INTRODUCTION.

A group of claimants ("the RSA Noteholders") have asserted administrative expense claims arising from the Reorganized Debtors' purported breach of a post-petition restructuring agreement, estimated to be in the aggregate of \$250,000,000, against the Reorganized Debtors. For the reasons explained

below, the court will sustain the objections of the Reorganized Debtors and disallow the claims.

II. PARTIES.

Elliott Management Corporation ("Elliott") on its own behalf and on behalf of certain funds and accounts managed, advised, or sub-advised by it, filed the *Motion for (i) Allowance and Payment of an Administrative Expense Claim and (ii) to the Extent Necessary, Reconsideration and Relief from the Confirmation Order Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b)* on July 24, 2020 (Dkt. 8536). This motion and request for allowance and payment of an administrative expense is based on a purported breach by Debtors of a post-petition restructuring agreement that they entered with certain noteholders (the "Noteholder RSA"). Elliott was joined by several similarly situated claimants who filed their *Joinder in the Pending Elliott Motion and Request for Allowance and Payment of Administrative Expense Claim* on August 4, 2020 (Dkt. 8663).¹ Pacific Investment Management Company LLC ("PIMCO") joined them and Elliott when it filed its *Joinder of Pacific Investment Management Company LLC in the Pending Elliott Motion and Request for Allowance and Payment of Administrative Expense Claim* on August 7, 2020 (Dkt. 8704).

¹ Joining Elliott at that time were: Canyon Capital Advisors LLC, Citadel Advisors LLC, Davidson Kempner Capital Management LP, Farallon Capital Management, L.L.C., Sculptor Master Fund, Ltd., Sculptor Enhanced Master Fund, Ltd., Sculptor Credit Opportunities Master Fund, Ltd., Sculptor GC Opportunities Master Fund, Ltd., Sculptor SC II, LP, and Värde Partners, Inc., on behalf of themselves, and/or certain funds and accounts managed, advised, or sub-advised by them.

1 PG&E Corporation and Pacific Gas and Electric Company
2 ("Reorganized Debtors") filed *Reorganized Debtors' Initial*
3 *Opposition to Elliott Management Corporation's Motion for*
4 *Allowance and Payment of Administrative Expense Claim and*
5 *Reconsideration of Confirmation Order and Related Joinders* as an
6 initial opposition to Elliott's Motion on August 26, 2020 (Dkt.
7 8864). Elliott and the others filed their respective responses:
8 *Elliott Management Corporation's Response to Reorganized*
9 *Debtors' Initial Opposition to Motion for (i) Allowance and*
10 *Payment of an Administrative Expense Claim and (ii) to the*
11 *Extent Necessary, Reconsideration and Relief from the*
12 *Confirmation Order Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure*
13 *60(b)* (Dkt. 9032) and *Additional RSA Noteholders' Response to*
14 *Reorganized Debtors' Initial Opposition to Elliott Motion for*
15 *Allowance and Payment of Administrative Expense Claim and*
16 *Reconsideration of Confirmation Order and Related Joinders* (Dkt.
17 9034) on September 14. Reorganized Debtors filed their *Reply in*
18 *Support of Initial Opposition to Elliott Management*
19 *Corporation's Motion for Allowance and Payment of Administrative*
20 *Expense Claim and Reconsideration of Confirmation Order and*
21 *Related Joinders* on September 25, 2020 (Dkt. 9143).

22 The motion came on for hearing on October 13, 2020.
23 Appearances were noted on the record.

24 **III. CRITICAL DATES, PLAN PROVISIONS AND PARAGRAPHS OF THE**
25 **OCP.**

26 On February 5, 2020, the court approved the Noteholder RSA
27 following extensive negotiations among the Reorganized Debtors
28

(prior to confirmation of their Plan), certain Shareholders Proponents, and certain holders of funded debt claims.

The court entered its *Order Confirming Debtors' and Shareholder Proponents' Joint Chapter 11 Plan of Reorganization Dated June 19, 2020* (the "OCP") on June 20, 2020, confirming the Debtors' and Shareholders Proponents' Joint Chapter 11 Plan of Reorganization Dated June 19, 2020 (the "Plan") (Dkt. 8053). The Plan became effective as of July 1, 2020 (the "Effective Date").

The critical and determinative provisions relevant to this decision are as follows:

Plan, Article 2.1 **Administrative Expense Claims**

Plan, Article 10.8 **Exculpation**

Plan, Article 10.9(b) ***Releases by Holders of Claims and Interest***

OCP, ¶ 54 **Exculpation**

OCP, ¶ 56 **Releases by Holders of Claims and Interest.**

The Noteholder RSA contains a provision ("the best efforts provision") that the RSA Noteholders contend the Reorganized Debtors breached, thus establishing a basis for their administrative expense claims. That is found in Section 3(a)(iv) of the Noteholder RSA and obligates the debtors (prior to confirmation and up to the Effective Date), and their attorneys, advisors, and agents to:

use their best efforts, which shall not require the Debtors to pay any consideration, breach any obligations, or otherwise violate the terms of any Backstop Commitment Letter, to cause various Backstop Parties to transfer (whether by assignment, participation, or otherwise) to

1 Consenting Noteholders that were parties to the
2 AHC Commitment Letter and any Consenting
3 Noteholders that were offered the opportunity to
4 participate in any subsequent commitment in
5 connection with the Alternative Plan, their
6 rights (subject to Section 7 hereof) (including
7 the right to receive fees thereunder) and
8 obligations under applicable Backstop Commitment
9 Letters relating to up to \$2 billion of
10 commitments.

11 **IV. PROCEDURAL STATUS.**

12 On August 11, 2020, the court entered an *Order Regarding*
13 *Scheduling with Respect to Elliott Management Corporation Motion*
14 *for Allowance and Payment of Administrative Expense Claim and*
15 *Related Joinders* (Dkt. 8746). There the court established a
16 procedure to determine whether the Reorganized Debtors could
17 prevail on the face of Elliott's motion, as joined by the
18 others, as a matter of law, avoiding the need for discovery or
19 other unnecessary delay. The Reorganized Debtors' challenge to
20 the administrative expense claims of the RSA Noteholders is a
21 contested matter under Fed. R. Bankr. P. 9014; that rule in turn
22 incorporates relevant provisions of the Federal Rules of Civil
23 Procedure via the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure.

24 Accordingly, the court treats the matters that were briefed
25 and argued on October 13, 2020 as the functional equivalent of a
26 motion for a judgment on the pleadings, taking all facts as
27 uncontested for these purposes. It determines as a matter of
28 law that the Reorganized Debtors are correct and their
objections should be sustained.

//

//

1 **V. DISCUSSION.**

2 **A. Administrative Expense Claims - Allowed or Disallowed**

3 The RSA Noteholders make much of a statement in Section 2.1
4 of the Plan that no administrative expense claims shall be
5 discharged and contend that their claim for breach of the
6 Noteholder RSA constitutes an administrative expense claim and
7 that Debtors' proposed treatment of the claim conflicts with
8 Articles 10.8 and 10.9 of the Plan and paragraphs 54 and 56 of
9 the OCP.

10 The court disagrees. Article 1.4 preserves expenses of
11 administration that are **allowable**; the corollary is that
12 administrative expense claims that are not allowable will be
13 discharged and, of course, will not be paid. As stated at the
14 outset, the court is disallowing the administrative expense
15 claims of the RSA Noteholders. The concern about discharge is
16 moot and no further action by the court is necessary as to this
17 issue.

18 **B. Negotiation and Pursuit of the Noteholder RSA**

19 In the *Memorandum of Decision - Confirmation of Debtors'*
20 *and Shareholder Proponents' Joint Chapter 11 Plan of*
21 *Reorganization* (Dkt. 8001), the court referred to the recent
22 Ninth Circuit *Blixseth* decision² in support of the proposition
23 that exculpation provisions permit protection of various parties
24 "who participated in the approval process", pointing out that
25 the exculpation provisions of the Plan cover a multitude of
26

27 ² *Blixseth v. Credit Suisse (In re Blixseth)*, 961 F.3d 1074 (9th Cir.
28 2020).

1 players, a number of documents and a number of events and
2 activities, consistent with the complexity and difficulties of
3 these cases. *Blixseth* itself cited *In re PWS Holding Corp.*, 228
4 F.3d 224 (3d Cir. 2000), for the notion that partial exculpation
5 is the norm for acts committed during the process of developing
6 and confirming a chapter 11 plan. Such provisions do not
7 conflict with 11 U.S.C. § 524(e).

8 For this reason, it is appropriate and consistent with
9 *Blixseth*, to extend exculpation to parties who participated,
10 negotiated and even "pursued" the Noteholder RSA and countless
11 other documents. But once the negotiation was completed, the
12 pursuit was over. Article 10.8 provides the safe harbor for all
13 who accomplished that end, for all who were "involved in the
14 process of developing and confirming [the Plan]". When the
15 Noteholder RSA was approved by the court on February 5, 2020
16 (Dkt. 5637) there was nothing further to negotiate or pursue
17 concerning that document. To use the vernacular, it was a "done
18 deal".

19 The RSA Noteholders are correct that they had the right to
20 contend at a later date that Reorganized Debtors, prior to or
21 concurrent with confirmation of the Plan, breached the best
22 efforts provision, subject to whatever defenses the Reorganized
23 Debtors may assert. Thus, the court concludes that the
24 exculpation provisions of Article 10.8, and the parallel
25 provisions of paragraph 54 of the OCP provide no relief for the
26 Reorganized Debtors.

27 //

1 **C. Releases by Holders of Claims and Interest**

2 In contrast to the narrow exculpation provisions dealing
3 with "negotiation and pursuit" of various documents and
4 including a fairly typical carveout for actual fraud or willful
5 misconduct, the release provisions and the parallel paragraph 56
6 of the OCP are quite a different story. There, there is no
7 carveout for actual fraud or willful misconduct nor any
8 limitation on the extent and breadth of what has been released.
9 The provisions are lengthy, somewhat redundant and very
10 lawyerlike. Below the court highlights certain provisions to
11 emphasize how far reaching they are and how readily they
12 encompass any alleged breach of the best efforts provision:

13 **"Released Parties** [including the Reorganized
14 Debtors] are deemed forever **released** and
15 discharged . . . from any and all claims, interests,
16 obligations, suits, judgments, damages, demands,
17 debts, rights, Causes of Action, losses, remedies,
18 and **liabilities whatsoever** . . . based on or
19 relating to, or in any manner arising from, in **whole**
20 **or in part**, the Debtors', the Fires', the Chapter 11
21 Cases . . . the subject matter of, or the
22 **transactions** or events giving rise to any
23 Claim . . . the business or contractual arrangements
24 between any Debtor and any Released Parties . . .
25 the **Plan Funding**, the Restructuring . . . before or
26 during the Chapter 11 Cases . . . the **Backstop**
27 **Commitment** Letters . . . the **Noteholder RSA** . . .
28 the negotiation, formulation, or preparation
of . . . the Plan and related agreements . . . , and
"other documents (including Plan documents) . . . ,
the **Noteholder RSA**"

25 Based upon these broad provisions the court determines that
26 the RSA Noteholders are bound by the releases they agreed to,
27 thus relieving the Reorganized Debtors of any exposure to claims
28

1 by the RSA Noteholders for breach of the Noteholder RSA and in
2 particular the best efforts provisions.

3 **D. Post Effective Date Claims**

4 The RSA Noteholders point to the preamble of Article
5 10.9(b) to maintain that somehow their right to assert the
6 administrative expense claims survives confirmation and the
7 Effective Date, and thus can be asserted, subject to substantive
8 defenses, at this juncture. The court rejects that argument.

9 Article 10.9(b) begins:

10 *"Releases by Holders of Claims and Interests. As*
11 *of and subject to the occurrence of the Effective*
12 *Date, except for the rights that remain in effect*
13 *from and after the Effective Date to enforce the*
Plan"

14 The RSA Noteholders argue that the Reorganized Debtors
15 breached the best efforts provision by not even attempting to
16 have any of the Backstop Commitment parties share with them any
17 of the fees and other entitlements up to \$2 billion of
18 commitments as provided in the portion of the Noteholder RSA
19 quoted above. The best efforts provision was a continuing
20 obligation for the duration of the RSA Support Period, defined
21 as running from the date of execution of the Noteholder RSA
22 through the Effective Date of the Plan. The provisions of
23 Section 3(a)(4) ended on that Effective Date and thus do not
24 come within the phrase "rights that **remain** in effect **from and**
25 **after** the Effective Date." The RSA Noteholders had no right to
26 complain about the Reorganized Debtors' lack of best efforts
27 once the obligations to exercise them ceased. The releases
28

1 became effective at the same time that the right to assert best
2 efforts ended. Whether the RSA Noteholders could have asserted
3 some sort of a breach prior to the Effective Date, and prior to
4 the effectiveness of the broad releases, is pure speculation.
5 It did not happen. The after-the-fact assertions of the
6 administrative expense claims were barred as a matter of law by
7 the operation of the releases in Article 10.9(b) and OCP ¶ 56 as
8 of the Effective Date.

9 **E. Other Issues**

10 Because the court is disallowing the RSA Noteholders'
11 administrative expense claims for the reasons stated above, it
12 need not address the alternative theories of waiver or
13 forfeiture asserted by the Reorganized Debtors.

14 RSA Noteholders ask for alternative relief from the OCP.
15 Reorganized Debtors are correct that modification of the Plan
16 could only be attempted in accordance with 11 U.S.C. § 1127(b).
17 And the RSA Noteholders are correct that Fed. R. Bankr. P. 9024,
18 incorporating Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b), has been a basis for relief
19 from orders confirming plans. On this record, however, nothing
20 justifies granting the extraordinary alternative relief they
21 seek.

22 The record does show that at a lightning fast pace in June,
23 2020, this complicated case proceeded quickly to meet state-
24 imposed deadlines and presented myriad obstacles for all
25 principal players and the court. Given that history, the court
26 believes that Elliott and the other concerned RSA Noteholders
27 could have dealt with procedural difficulties such as the
28

1 original confirmation objection deadline or the fact that the
2 confirmation record had been closed by the time of the June 9,
3 2020, Backstop Motion. They could have sought some form of
4 expedited relief before entry of the OCP were they so included.

5 All major players are and were represented by some of the
6 most experienced and qualified bankruptcy counsel in the
7 country, and they know how to act quickly and effectively when
8 they need to. While the court will not engage in a theoretical
9 debate about whether one side waited in the weeds or the other
10 side tried to hide the ball, it will decline to excise its
11 discretion by reconsidering the OCP under Fed. R. Bankr. P. 9024
12 or otherwise.

13 **VI. CONCLUSION.**

14 The court is concurrently issuing orders disallowing the
15 administrative expense claims of Elliott, the Additional RSA
16 Noteholders and PIMCO for the reasons stated in this memorandum
17 decision.

18 *** END OF MEMORANDUM DECISION***
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28